

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

CARLOS EDUARDO ARDILES-ADRAZ,

Petitioner,

v.

PAMELA BONDI et al.,

Respondents.

CASE NO. 2:25-cv-00353-LK

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATION

This matter comes before the Court on the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) of United States Magistrate Judge S. Kate Vaughan. Dkt. No. 12. Judge Vaughan recommends that the Court deny Petitioner Carlos Eduardo Ardiles-Adraz’s 28 U.S.C. § 2241 immigration habeas petition as moot because Mr. Ardiles-Adraz seeks only release from detention, he has been removed from the United States, and there are no collateral consequences that could be addressed by the Court. *Id.* at 1–2. Mr. Ardiles-Adraz has not filed any objections to the R&R.

When considering the R&R, the Court “shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made,” and “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations

1 made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3) (the Court
2 “must determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge’s disposition that has been properly
3 objected to”). As the statute and rule suggest, the Court reviews findings and recommendations “*if*
4 *objection is made*, but not otherwise.” *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir.
5 2003) (en banc) (“Neither the Constitution nor the statute requires a district judge to review, de
6 novo, findings and recommendations that the parties themselves accept as correct.”).

7 Having considered the R&R and the balance of the record, the Court agrees that Mr.
8 Ardiles-Adraz’s habeas petition is moot. *See Abdala v. INS*, 488 F.3d 1061, 1064 (9th Cir. 2007)
9 (holding that “for a habeas petition to continue to present a live controversy after the petitioner’s
10 release or deportation . . . there must be some remaining ‘collateral consequence’ that may be
11 redressed by success on the petition.”). The Court thus ADOPTS Judge Vaughan’s Report and
12 Recommendation, Dkt. No. 12, and DISMISSES Mr. Ardiles-Adraz’s habeas petition, Dkt. No. 1,
13 as moot.

14 Dated this 4th day of June, 2025.

15 

16 Lauren King
17 United States District Judge
18
19
20
21
22
23
24